

1 And I appreciate the opportunity to speak in front
2 of this group. And I would like everybody who's remaining
3 here, to be able to make sure that you write to the people
4 that are listed in the Star, the contact people for your
5 elected officials, including Governor Schwarzenegger,
6 against this. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Okay, let me read those
9 names again, in case someone missed it. Leticia Pineda,
10 Marlene Herman, Jim McComb, Paula Simental, and Edward
11 Huerta.

12 Okay, the next speaker cards that I have are for
13 Rosa Elia Castillo, David Sweet. It looks like Chris Laber,
14 Wendy Steiger, Barbara Macri-Ortiz, Shirley Godwin.

15 Go ahead, sir. Are you one of the names?

16 MR. SWEET: Yes, sir.

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Go ahead.

18 MR. SWEET: Good evening, my name is David Sweet,
19 I'm Executive Director of the International LNG Alliance,
20 based in Washington D.C. Our members represent the entire
21 LNG value chain, from liquefaction, shipping, and
22 regasification. We're located in the United States, and
23 around the world, and import a majority of the LNG delivered
24 to North America.

25 We also serve as the sole U.S. representative on

T005-83.9

T005-83.9

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTS
T005-84

1 LNG to the International Gas Union. BHP Billiton is a
2 member of ILNGA.

3 We strongly support the development of LNG
4 infrastructure and trade as a partial solution to the energy
5 crisis facing California and the U.S.

6 Development of LNG receiving terminals, such as
7 BHP Billiton's Cabrillo Point project, is desperately needed
8 today, if LNG is to supply the energy needs of tomorrow.

9 I'm here, this evening, to provide a brief
10 perspective on the critical role that LNG can play in
11 meeting our nation's energy needs.

12 The facts are simple, the U.S. needs additional
13 natural gas supplies to supplement dwindling domestic
14 production.

15 The vast majority of the world's natural gas
16 supplies are located outside of North America and are
17 currently stranded, meaning they are sitting idle, awaiting
18 a viable market.

19 LNG technology allows companies, like BHP
20 Billiton, to access these reserves and deliver affordable
21 and reliable supplies of clean natural gas to homes and
22 businesses.

23 While the U.S. accounts for over a quarter of
24 global natural gas consumption, 96 percent of the world's
25 natural gas reserves are located outside of North America.

T005-84.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-84.1

T005-84.2

Thank you for the information.

T005-84.2

1 But with only four LNG import terminals in the lower 48,
2 none of which are on the West Coast, our ability to access
3 these gas reserves is dangerously limited.

4 The gap between supply and demand in U.S. natural
5 gas markets is quickly widening and needs to be filled. We
6 must develop the infrastructure that will allow us to tap
7 into the world's vast supply of natural gas.

8 In other words, we must immediately begin the task
9 of permitting and constructing additional regas terminals,
10 such as Cabrillo Point -- Port.

11 In California, consumers saw the direct effects of
12 having limited natural gas supplies in the years 2000-2001.
13 When transportation capacity between natural gas fields in
14 Texas and the California border constrained supplies, the
15 cost of natural gas skyrocketed, and with it the cost of
16 electricity. The record energy prices we have been
17 experiencing have hurt the economy, consumers, businesses,
18 workers, and the environment.

19 If California were able to access the incredible
20 resources of Australia, the Pacific Rim, and the rest of the
21 world, in the words of Federal Reserve Board Chairman
22 Greenspan, "it would add a safety valve as protection
23 against soaring natural gas prices."

24 However, the U.S. is not alone in its thirst for
25 clean-burning natural gas supplies. There are a number of

T005-84.2
(cont'd)

1 proposed LNG receiving terminals that would serve gas
2 markets in Europe and the UK, as well as ambitious plans to
3 supply China and India with imported LNG.

4 While the U.S. is a highly desirable natural gas
5 market, it is by no means the only market. Unless the
6 infrastructure's in place, these energy supplies will go
7 elsewhere. And because LNG is typically sold under long-
8 term contracts, it means that these supply options might be
9 lost for many years to come.

10 The weak link in the chain is the ability to
11 regasify LNG into the U.S. Delaying the construction of LNG
12 receiving terminals can have repercussions throughout the
13 delivery chain and even further delays and cost increases.

14 Thank you very much.

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: And again, you can turn in
16 written comments of any length you'd like. Thank you.

17 MR. SWEET: Thank you.

18 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Rosa Elia Castillo? Chris
19 Laber? Wendy Steiger? Barbara Macri-Ortiz?

20 MS. MACRI-ORTIZ: Yes, thank you. My name is
21 Barbara Macri-Ortiz, I'm an attorney, and I live and work in
22 the City of Oxnard.

23 Listening to everybody tonight, it seems to me
24 pretty clear that you've got a lot of work to do because
25 this -- the state of the environmental documents are not in

T005-84.2
(cont'd)

COMMENTER
T005-85

1 any kind of a state that you could reasonable approve them
2 at this point.

3 But I think we need to look beyond what we're
4 doing here, look beyond the forest, for the trees.

5 The gentleman in front of me was talking about,
6 well, gee, we better hurry up and get the natural gas here
7 because, if not, maybe China will get it. God forbid some
8 other country gets to use some resources on this earth,
9 besides ourselves. I think it's about time that the United
10 States, the citizens of the richest country in the world,
11 take some responsibility for themselves, and we need to
12 start developing alternative fuels.

13 You know, when are we going to wait, are we going
14 to wait until the last fossil fuel that's out there, that we
15 use that before we start developing? We have to start
16 developing. And we can't just keep looking at, well, who's
17 got -- who's got a resource that we can rip off. I think
18 it's time we've got to take some responsibility, we've got
19 to start developing solar energy, whether it's wind energy,
20 whatever.

21 Like a lot of people have testified, we're a very
22 smart country, if we just allow or force ourselves. You
23 know, when Kennedy became President, he forced us to go to
24 the moon. He said, we can do it, and it got done.

25 What we need is some leadership in this country

T005-85.1

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-85.1

1 that says, by God, we have to develop some alternate form of
2 energy and let's do it. And if we start focusing on that,
3 rather than focusing on, well, can we take this risk, you
4 know, is it safe? Are we going to blow up the City of
5 Oxnard, or what? You know, how far are we willing to go to
6 feed all our needs? Maybe we need to start learning how to
7 alter our conduct so that we can live within our resources
8 and develop resources that will make this a cleaner,
9 healthier, better place.

10 And rather than our children -- it was
11 interesting, the younger speakers come up and say, gee, we
12 need more fuel. We've got to teach our youth to develop
13 something for themselves, that we can keep this country
14 going. Because it -- we will run out of fuel. Whether
15 China gets or we get it, eventually we will run out of fuel
16 unless we figure out another way. And I think this is about
17 time that we start.

18 Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Shirley Godwin?

21 MS. GODWIN: Yes, my name is Shirley Godwin, and
22 I've been a resident of South Oxnard for 42 years.

23 It is obvious, in reading the environmental
24 document, that the authors consider everything that is
25 important to this community unimportant, when considering

T005-85.1
(cont'd)

COMMENTER
T005-86

1 the impacts of this project.

2 We are not a wealthy community, but we value our
3 people, our health, air quality, marine life, our military
4 bases, our farms, our fishermen, our tourists, and our
5 quality of life.

6 The environment -- as an example, the
7 Environmental Justice section of the EIS/EIR does not
8 address all the impacts and is, therefore, not adequate.
9 This section takes a very narrow view of environmental
10 justice and only considers a small section of the pipeline
11 route, past two mobile home parks.

12 All populated areas of Oxnard, especially South
13 Oxnard, along with Port Hueneme and the adjacent county
14 areas, must be studied in regard to air quality.

15 The prevailing wind is onshore. Pollutants from
16 the operation of the FSRU, emissions from the LNG tanker
17 ships, and all construction operation and related emissions
18 will be carried over these populated areas, affecting low
19 income and minority populations.

20 These populations are already impacted by air
21 pollution from the two power plants in our area, both of
22 them in Oxnard, the diesel emissions from the ships and
23 trucks servicing the Port of Hueneme, and the heavy industry
24 in the Ormond Beach area.

25 The EIR/EIS must evaluate the cumulative impacts

T005-86.1

T005-86.1

Section 4.19 describes the methodology used to evaluate environmental justice issues, and Section 4.19.3 provides the criteria that were used in the analysis. Section 4.19.4 discusses the impacts that were eliminated from the analysis either because they were not considered to be significant after mitigation or because they would not subject low income or minority populations to a greater or lesser impact than other communities.

Section 4.19.4 also contains information on Project modifications since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR that reduce potential impacts on minority or low-income residents in the mobile home parks along the Center Road pipeline route.

T005-86.2

The Project has been modified since issuance of the March 2006 Revised Draft EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on Project emissions and proposed control measures. Section 4.6.4 discusses the health effects attributed to air pollutants and includes revised impacts and mitigation measures.

Section 4.1.8.5 contains information on meteorology and climate in the Project area, including average wind speed and direction. As discussed in Impact AIR-8 in Section 4.6.4, an ambient air impacts analysis was conducted using the Offshore and Coastal Dispersion Model to evaluate potential impacts on ambient air concentrations of pollutants at downwind locations in the Pacific Ocean and along the coast of California (see Appendix G7 for a summary of the analysis). As stated, "an air quality analysis of criteria pollutants emitted from FSRU equipment and Project vessels indicates that the projected increases in the ambient concentrations of criteria pollutants would neither violate any applicable air quality standards nor contribute substantially to existing or projected air quality violations."

T005-86.3

Section 4.20.6 addresses cumulative air quality impacts.

T005-86.3

1 of the existing air pollution, combined with the new
2 pollution created by the BHP Billiton project.

3 The EIS/EIR must address how many additional cases
4 of cancer, asthma, and respiratory illness in the affected
5 populations will be caused by the pollution generated by the
6 construction and operation of this LNG project.

7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker cards I
10 have are for Eileen Tracy, Larry Godwin, Glenn Hening, Amy
11 Spandrio, and Rudy D. Liporada. Are any of those people
12 here?

13 Go ahead.

14 MS. TRACY: Hi, I'm Eileen Tracy, and I live in
15 South Oxnard, less than one mile from the proposed route of
16 the pipeline.

17 And I wanted to bring something to your attention.
18 Many of the proponents of the project, that spoke here
19 tonight, I hope you noticed, don't live here. I want to
20 really make sure that you noticed that. At least I
21 didn't -- the last speaker, I didn't -- he didn't even say
22 where he lives. The other one lives over in Camarillo.

23 So I was going to talk to you about the EIR saying
24 the low risk, as we all are talking about, because we don't
25 believe it.

T005-86.3
(cont'd)

T005-86.4

T005-86.4

The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on Project emissions and proposed control measures. Section 4.6.4 discusses the health effects attributed to air pollutants and includes revised impacts and mitigation measures.

T005-87.1

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

COMMENTER
T005-87

T005-87.1

1 And I had been listening to a Rear Admiral, from
 2 the Department of Homeland Security, he mentioned, on CSPAN,
 3 that he has extra procedures at Boston Harbor because of
 4 LNG. And I know that the Department of Homeland isn't doing
 5 enough security. We know our -- there's not enough security
 6 in our ports, and cargo on the aircraft, but they actually
 7 have something special for LNG. So that tells you that even
 8 though a lot of people are telling us, tonight, that it's
 9 perfectly safe, the government doesn't believe it's
 10 perfectly safe, or they wouldn't have these extra
 11 procedures.

12 So I wrote to some of you already, and sent e-
 13 mails, bringing to your attention, also, that we don't have
 14 adequate evacuation routes here, in the Oxnard Plain.
 15 There's only five roads, most of them are two-lane country
 16 roads, and we could never evacuate if there were an
 17 accident.

18 So that's the reason people are saying why are you
 19 choosing Oxnard. And I'm telling you that's the reason why
 20 not to choose Oxnard, because we have that double danger.

21 And finally, because I truly believe this is an
 22 experimental station, as many of the previous speakers have
 23 brought up and -- thank you -- and being -- studying
 24 history, as I have in this local area, and I can remind you
 25 that there have been many shipwrecks here, on our coastline,

T005-87.1
(cont'd)

T005-87.2

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical distance (6.5 miles) from the shoreline.

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools. The analysis indicate that an accident requiring the evacuation of the Oxnard Plain is not reasonably foreseeable.

T005-87.2

T005-87.3

The USCG, MARAD, and the CLSC received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County. The USCG and MARAD are therefore required under NEPA to evaluate this alternative as the Applicant's preferred alternative. The agencies have evaluated this alternative in comparison with the other reasonable alternatives in compliance with NEPA and the CEQA.

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Section 3.3.7 contains information on other locations that were considered.

T005-87.3

T005-87.4

T005-87.4

Section 4.3.4 contains information on potential impacts associated with the increased vessel traffic due to the proposed Project. The FSRU would be located 3.5 NM (3.54 miles) from the eastern boundary of the Point Mugu Sea Range (Pacific Missile Range). Impacts MT-5 and MT-6 in Section 4.3.4 address potential Project impacts on Naval and Point Mugu Sea Range operations.

1 since the inception of the original harbors. The wharves
 2 have been torn apart by vicious, winter, violent storms that
 3 sweep through our coast.

4 We've had enemy submarines sailing through,
 5 targeting us, you know, so really -- and then we have
 6 nuclear ships pulling into the Navy, the Navy yards here.
 7 So I mean, the worst that you can think of is a collision
 8 between an LNG tanker, that has not unloaded, and a nuclear
 9 ship. And then here, we can't even evacuate.

10 So I wanted to ask you one thing, would you like
 11 to buy a house in South Oxnard, would you really like to
 12 live here, next to an LNG facility? That's really the
 13 question to ask. And Governor Schwarzenegger probably isn't
 14 going to be around in California long enough, otherwise I'd
 15 invite him down here, also.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Larry Godwin?

19 MR. GODWIN: My name is Larry Godwin. I came to
 20 Oxnard in 1962, to work at Point Magu Naval Air Station, as
 21 a physicist.

22 Validation of the computer models used to
 23 determine hazard areas has not been done. The largest spill
 24 test of LNG has been 10,000 gallons. This is a drop in the
 25 bucket when compared to 58 million gallons for a tanker, or

T005-87.4
(cont'd)

T005-88.1

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed the preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it. See Section 4.2, Appendix C1, and Appendix C2 for additional information on third-party verification of the IRA.

COMMENTS
T005-88

T005-88.1

1 72 million gallons for the FSRU.

2 Because of the complexity of LNG spills, it is
3 impossible to predict or model beyond the largest
4 experimental LNG spill.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Glenn Hening?

8 Amy Spandrio?

9 MS. SPANDRIO: Good evening, my name is
10 Amy Spandrio. I was not going to speak tonight, but I was
11 inspired by some of the other comments I heard, previously.

12 I am a student, locally. I'm not from UCLA. I
13 was not asked to come here tonight by any corporation or
14 government official.

15 I'm a senior, majoring in environmental science
16 and resource manager at California State University, Channel
17 Islands.

18 I have researched LNG extensively, and I feel I'm
19 pretty well educated on the subject.

20 My family has been farming on the Oxnard Plain
21 since the late 1800s, and I personally live in Camarillo,
22 and the majority of my family is still in the area.

23 We can argue all night about the positive and
24 negative aspects of LNG, but the bottom line is that it is
25 still a fossil fuel. It still creates pollution, and it

T005-88.1
(cont'd)

T005-89.1
Thank you for the information.

T005-89.2
Sections 4.6, 4.12, and 4.18 contain information concerning
potential pollution from the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T005-89

T005-89.1

T005-89.2

1 still has the potential to be extremely dangerous in the
2 wrong situation.

3 The longer we prolong our reliance on fossil
4 fuels, especially those from foreign countries, the more
5 uncertain we make our future.

6 We need to invest in renewable resources, now. We
7 cannot afford to wait until we truly are in a crisis
8 situation, and renewables are our only hope.

9 If the blackouts proved anything, it's that we
10 rely too heavily on fossil fuels and we must invest in
11 renewable resources, now, before it is too late.

12 As the speaker before me said, I think the United
13 States, in its position of power and wealth, has a
14 responsibility to the rest of the world to take the lead for
15 renewable sources of energy. We have five percent of the
16 population of the globe, but we consume 25 percent of the
17 resources. That is a fact that is easily proved anywhere
18 you look.

19 The real reason why I was here tonight is because
20 the preferred pipeline route goes under my family's
21 farmland. And as I said, we've been farming this land since
22 the late 1800s, we continue to farm it today. I plan on
23 continuing the tradition of farming that land, when it gets
24 passed into my hands, and I plan on passing it into my
25 children's hands. Having an LNG pipeline under the land is

T005-89.3

T005-89.3
Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

T005-89.4

T005-89.4
Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

T005-89.5

Section 2.4 contains information on how easements would be acquired.

Section 4.5.4 has been updated and contains additional information on potential impacts on agriculture from construction and operations and measures to address them.

Only natural gas and not LNG would be transported through offshore and onshore pipelines. Section 4.2.8 addresses safety issues related to natural gas pipelines. Section 4.2.8.4 contains information on the estimated risk of Project pipeline incidents.

T005-89.5

1 the last thing I want. And this is not simply a case of
2 NIMBY, this is true concern.

3 You've heard from all these wonderful citizens
4 tonight, who have spent hours and hours waiting to talk to
5 you. We all appreciate you being here, giving us your time
6 and attention.

7 But I think if tonight proves anything, the only
8 people who are for this project are people from outside of
9 the area. We're all very concerned for all very true and
10 valid reasons.

11 I want to see this -- our farmland preserved. If
12 the people of Ventura County have proved anything, it's how
13 important their farmland is to them. Because we did pass
14 the *SOAR ordinance, which I know has no merit in this case,
15 it cannot stand up to this LNG project, there's always
16 eminent domain, we all understand that, and that's probably
17 what it will come down to with our family, because we won't
18 go out quietly.

19 But Ventura County does value its farmland. It's
20 some of the most fertile in the world, for those of you who
21 do not know that, and we need to preserve it.

22 And I know that the EIR did say that impacts would
23 be mitigated to below significant, but that's taking into
24 account a potential rupture or accident.

25 That's all, thank you very much.

T005-89.5
(cont'd)

1 (Applause.)

2 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Rudy Liporada?

3 MR. LIPORADA: My name is Rudy Liporada, I'm from
4 Oxnard. I come here as the Deputy Director of the Filipino
5 American Council. We are still in the process of educating
6 16,000 Filipino Americans in Ventura County on the pros and
7 cons of the LNG.

8 But I already represent those of us who are
9 against it. We don't think that LNG is the way to go. Like
10 the gentleman ahead of me, I am also a believer of Murphy's
11 Law. To reiterate, the law says, if something could happen,
12 it will happen.

13 Like the recent tanker spill, recently in the
14 east, which is not the first, like the Enron incident, those
15 things were not supposed to happen. An accident could
16 happen with LNG.

17 Yes, we need energy, but this is not the way to
18 go.

19 For those who know, the technology already exists.
20 The technology for harnessing solar energy already exists.
21 All we have to do is concentrate on it and spend all the
22 federal research funds necessary so that they can be fully
23 harnessed and that we could have real cheap energy.

24 LNG is not also just a NIMBY question. If the
25 Governor has already approved this, this will necessitate to

COMMENTER
T005-90

T005-90.1

T005-90.2

T005-90.3

T005-90.4

T005-90.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-90.2

Section 4.2 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C) describe the potential public safety risks and the regulations, guidelines, and mitigation measures designed to prevent accidents.

Impacts PS-1 and PS-2 address potential incidents at the FSRU or LNG carrier and PS-3, PS-4 and PS-5 address potential releases from the onshore or offshore pipelines.

T005-90.3

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

T005-90.4

The Governor has not made a decision regarding the proposed Project. Section 1.1.2 contains information on the role of the Governor of California in deepwater port licensing.

1 use the word, used by Mayor-Elect Tom Holden, when he was
2 campaigning, "this would need an uprising." This will be an
3 uprising against the SSS, "Stop Schwarzenegger Stooges."

4 Thank you.

5 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speakers I have
6 cards for are Gordon Birr, John Hatcher, and Ron Gaiser. Is
7 Gordon Birr here?

8 MR. BIRR: Yeah.

9 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

10 MR. BIRR: My name is Gordon Birr, I'm a resident
11 of Channel Islands Beach.

12 And I've gone through the EIR and I find it very
13 lacking in regards to the emergency services aspect. Most
14 of the people here, this evening, talked about, around that
15 area in regards to terrorism and what have you.

16 And I'm a member of the, and certified, of the
17 DART team, in Ventura County, which is disaster preparedness
18 through the Sheriff's Department, and also been certified
19 through the CERT program, in the City of Oxnard, the
20 Community Emergency Response Team, and presently head up the
21 Channel Islands Beach Emergency Response Team, the Channel
22 Islands Beach Community Services District.

23 And through our training, on the way up here I
24 said, gee, you know, after going through that EIR, they
25 really didn't adequately address all of the emergency

T005-91.1
Sections 4.2.4.2 and 4.16.1.2 contain information on emergency
management.

COMMENTER
T005-91

T005-91.1

1 response nature of this proposal.

2 And so as a member of that team, I carry my
3 preparedness book in the car, and this is one that the OES,
4 the Office of Emergency Services, of the Ventura County
5 Sheriff's Department publishes, and they give the training.
6 And the materials covered here are for Ventura County, and
7 possible scenarios are hazardous materials, imminent and
8 actual flooding, imminent and actual dam failure, nuclear
9 defense emergencies, wildfires, major transportation,
10 airline accidents, landslides, tsunamis, offshore oil
11 spills, and earthquakes, et cetera. And then they go
12 through and they assess all of the impacts.

13 And that has not been referenced in that document.
14 That all needs to be covered.

15 And as part of this document, they show the
16 California Risk Assessment Map. I think the people here
17 would be very surprised to find out what's really in this
18 document. This risk assessment shows all of the possible
19 high risk areas, and they break it down into Ventura County
20 Risk Assessment Map, also. And a major concern is Port
21 Hueneme, the two, the bases down the coast, the old rocket
22 dieing facility, which doesn't exist anymore, and they also
23 show San Nicolas Island here.

24 And it's kind of barren between Point Magu, and
25 Malibu, and LAX, but if you put this facility there, you're

T005-91.1
(cont'd)

T005-91.2

The FSRU would be located 3.5 NM (3.54 miles) from the eastern boundary of the Point Mugu Sea Range (Pacific Missile Range). Impacts MT-5 and MT-6 in Section 4.3.4 discuss the potential impacts of the presence of the FSRU on Naval operations and the operation of the Point Mugu Sea Range.

The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore from populated areas, as shown on Figure ES-1.

T005-91.2

1 going to have another black spot on the map here, and that
 2 hasn't been addressed, either, what its impact and risk will
 3 be to the community.

4 Also, your pipeline description is very innocuous
 5 in that in this document they also address all the existing
 6 gas and oil well pipelines off the coast, through the
 7 various beaches, and they only talk about eight-inch pipes,
 8 gas pipes coming into Mandalay Beach, and ten-inch pipes.

9 And here, we're proposing two 24-inch pipes coming
 10 off the facility. And if you do your basic math, you'll
 11 find out that the difference between a 24-inch pipe and an
 12 eight-inch pipe is really 11 times, 11 and a half times the
 13 volume of gas being carried.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: John Hatcher, III.

17 MR. HATCHER: My name is John R. Hatcher, III.

18 I'm President of Ventura County NAACP, plus the fact I have
 19 a local TV show here.

20 And one of the things I want to talk about is the
 21 fact that I find it so sad that we, the people who own
 22 property, and live here, come up here and pleading to you to
 23 do something for our protection.

24 I really don't see the need of us begging you to
 25 change your process, as it's going to affect us. And since

T005-91.2
(cont'd)

T005-91.3

COMMENTER
T005-92

T005-92.1

T005-91.3

Section 2.4 contains information on the proposed onshore pipelines and facilities. Section 4.10.1.1 discusses the oil and gas resources near the proposed FSRU and subsea pipelines. Section 2.3.1 describes the fiber optic cables that the proposed pipelines would cross. Section 4.2.8 addresses safety issues related to natural gas pipelines. Section 4.2.8.4 contains information on the estimated risk of Project pipeline incidents.

T005-92.1

Section 1.1 discusses regulations and agencies involved in the licensing and potential approval of the proposed Project. The USCG and MARAD will hold a final public hearing on the license with a 45-day comment period before the Federal Record of Decision is issued. The CSLC also will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease.

Section 1.5 contains additional information regarding public notification and opportunities for public comment.

1 I feel that way, that means that I need to sit down and take
 2 a look at what avenues that we can use to stop the process.
 3 And by stopping the process is that we have attorney
 4 generals, we have State attorney generals, and so maybe we
 5 need to start drafting some major letters, saying we're not
 6 getting the real story, and the real story is that you're
 7 not telling us what we need to know.

8 And the most important thing is to find out that
 9 we have LNG coming into the community that people now, and
 10 last year, are really talking about, and had no idea what
 11 was coming on.

12 A young man talked about, a while earlier, about
 13 the fact that liquid oxygen, and I can tell you from an
 14 experience, working in the missile area, we used to take a
 15 live snake, and put it in that liquid oxygen, and take it
 16 out and throw it on the ground, and it would shatter because
 17 it was frozen that fast, or drop in oil and it would
 18 explode.

19 And I would hate to see us, as community people,
 20 to wake up and find that there's a pipeline leaking, and the
 21 air blowing into the city, that our people are dying because
 22 of the pollution that's coming off of the LNG plant.

23 So somewhere, we're not being told the real story.
 24 We are here pleading to you, as if you are the one that have
 25 the right in this city. I understand. And the city is

T005-92.1
(cont'd)

T005-92.2
Section 4.1.7.1 contains information on the properties of LNG.

T005-92.3
Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised
information on public safety.

T005-92.4
Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on emissions from
Project construction and operations. Appendices G1 and G2
include the assumptions and emission factors used to calculate
emissions.

T005-92.2

T005-92.5
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken
into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed
Project.

T005-92.3

T005-92.4

T005-92.5

1 beholden to us.

2 And so maybe what we need to do, and when I'm
3 saying we, I'm talking about all of us here, we need to go
4 down to our cities and sit down and tell them if, in fact,
5 that if they have approved this program, that they need to
6 amend the program and disapprove it.

7 It is our city who voted to allow LNG to come in
8 here, and it is our responsibilities, as citizens, to say we
9 don't want this in here. If you can put it in some other
10 place, and pipe some stuff down here, it's a different
11 story.

12 But why Oxnard? And that's what everybody's been
13 saying. Why couldn't you put it other places?

14 And so I'm sticking to the fact of why Oxnard, why
15 not someplace else. Thank you very much.

16 (Applause.)

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Ron Gaiser?

18 Mr. Prescott, that exhausts the cards that I had
19 turned in to me. I'm going to turn the meeting back over to
20 you.

21 MR. PRESCOTT: Is there anyone who has not spoken?

22 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

23 MS. BROWN: My name is Pat Brown, I'm a resident
24 of Oxnard. And I've been sitting here, listening, all
25 evening, and hoping that someone else would say what I'm

T005-92.5
(cont'd)

T005-92.6

The USCG, MARAD, and the CLSC received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County. The USCG and MARAD are therefore required under NEPA to evaluate this alternative as the Applicant's preferred alternative. The agencies have evaluated this alternative in comparison with the other reasonable alternatives in compliance with NEPA and the CEQA.

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Section 3.3.7 contains information on other locations that were considered.

T005-92.6

COMMENTER
T005-93

1 going to have to say, but no one has. So I'm going to.

2 If you'll look on the latest map that you've
3 shown, of the direction coming up from the beach, where the
4 pipeline crosses Fifth Street and comes onto Del Norte,
5 heading towards the freeway, and you'll notice at that
6 point, if you look on a map, that that also crosses the
7 railroad tracks at Fifth Street. You'll also notice that it
8 goes right through a major oil well area, where we have
9 lines of oil derricks, one after another, after another,
10 within maybe 100, 150 foot between each. Rows, and rows,
11 and rows of those. And a plant that manufactures asphalt.

12 Then you cross the railroad tracks at Fifth
13 Street, and you come up one block and you'll come to a major
14 service station for the big, huge trucks, trailer rigs to
15 get gas. And then there's, right next to it, just on the
16 north side of that, is a regular gas station for the public.

17 Now, picture an explosion at that area, and the
18 AMTRAK coming through on the railroad tracks, and the oil
19 wells, and then the fuel trucks, and the gasoline, and what
20 not, from these big, huge tanker trucks filling up and
21 unloading, and so forth, there. I mean, I can just imagine
22 just a disaster.

23 Okay, thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. PRESCOTT: Is there anyone else who has not

T005-93.1

T005-93.1

The proposed pipeline route has moved since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR, and would no longer cross through the area described. See Figure 3.4-2 for the revised route through Oxnard.

1 spoken, who would like to speak at this time?

2 I would say, I'd like to thank everyone for their
3 patience in sticking around, as late as it is, to make your
4 comments be known to us.

5 And I think it's getting pretty late and at this
6 time we're going to adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

7 (Thereupon, the November 30th
8 evening meeting and public hearing
9 concerning the Cabrillo Port
10 Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater
11 Port, was adjourned at 11:05 p.m.)

12 --oOo--

13 * * * * *

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, RONALD J. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Department of Transportation, and California State Lands Commission public hearing on the Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port was recorded by my staff, thereafter transcribed into typewriting, and personally proofread by me.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in this matter, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of December, 2004.

Ronald J. Peters

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License Number 2780

Certified Manager of Reporting Services

Registered Professional Reporter

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345